

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 9-18, 21-28, and 31-33 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3-6, 12, 14-16, 23, and 25-28 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks.

### **II. The § 102/103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 12, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mohan.

Claims 1-6, 9-18, 21-28, and 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohan in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,716,528 (“Crus”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for controlling concurrency of access to data in a database system. The method includes receiving a lock request for access to data in the database system, in which the lock request is a request for a *page lock* or a *row lock* for a corresponding row or page in the database system containing the data. The method further includes associating the lock request with a partition lock on a partition that contains the row or the page in the database system containing the data, in which the partition lock locks the partition at a lock state that permits serialized access to data in the partition.

*A. Mohan Fails To Disclose Associating a Page Lock Request or a Row Lock Request*

*With a Partition Lock on a Partition, in which the Partition Lock Locks The Partition at a Lock State That Permits Serialized Access To Data in the Partition*

Mohan discloses a method and apparatus for reading data pages in a transaction processing system without locking the pages (see Abstract). With regard to locking, Mohan

discloses obtaining locks at granularities such as record locks (e.g., row locks), page locks, table locks, and file locks (e.g., table space locks) (col. 5, ll. 63-65).

Although Mohan discloses obtaining locks at different granularities, Mohan fails to disclose locking a partition at a lock state that permits serialized access to data in the partition, as recited in claim 1.

*B. Crus Fails To Disclose Associating a Page Lock Request or a Row Lock Request With a Partition Lock on a Partition, in which the Partition Lock Locks The Partition at a Lock State That Permits Serialized Access To Data in the Partition*

Crus discloses a method for managing lock escalation in a multi processing environment (see Abstract). In particular, Crus discloses using tablespace locking to limit the amount of storage needed for holding locks – i.e., to avoid too many page locks from being concurrently held by multiple users, a page locking protocol is escalated to a tablespace locking protocol (col. 3, l. 63 – col. 4, l. 2).

Crus (as with Mohan), however, fails to disclose or suggest locking a partition at a lock state that permits serialized access to data in the partition, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Crus discloses only escalating a page locking protocol to that of a tablespace locking protocol to avoid lock storage capacity from being exceeded (col. 2, l. 61 – col. 3, l. 2).

*C. The claim has limitations not taught by either reference*

Both Mohan and Crus fail to disclose locking a partition at a lock state that permits serialized access to data in the partition, as recited in claim 1. Consequently, Mohan and Crus cannot render claim 1 obvious or anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2-6 and 9-11 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to claim 1.

*D. Other Independent Claims*

Independent claims 12 and 23 (and the claims that depend therefrom) incorporate limitations similar to claim 1, and are also allowable for at least the reasons that apply to claim 1.

Should any unresolved issues remain or should the claims need any further clarifying amendments to expedite allowance of the pending application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,  
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

November 28, 2007

/Kelvin M. Vivian/  
Kelvin M. Vivian  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 53,727  
(650) 475-1448